



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/407,307	09/29/1999	TADASHIGE IWAO	1359.1013	2590

21171 7590 09/11/2003
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT PAPER-NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

24

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/407,307

Applicant(s)

IWAO ET AL.

Examiner

VAN H NGUYEN

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to amendment A filed on June 20, 2003. Claims 1-10 remain in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brown** (U.S. 5,794,219).

As to claim 1, Brown discloses an object collaboration apparatus comprising:

- a plurality of objects (*a central computer, a number of remote computers, bidders; col.3, lines 44-65*), each object comprising a message receiving portion to monitor and obtain a message (*bids entered from the remote computers are received in the center computer... the bidding groups and the total bids are also displayed on the remote computers; col.3, line 44- col.4, line 7/an electronic mail server E2 for sending new account confirmation message 34 to bidder 38 at remote computer 30. Remote computer 30 has an electronic mail client E3 for receiving and confirming new account confirmation message 34; col.5, lines 55-65*) transmitted over a network (*a computer net work; col.3, lines 44-65*);

- an action executing portion to execute processing in accordance with the action content
(central computer 18 receives bid entry form 76... central computer 18 determines if the bidding session is completed; col.7, line 60-col.8, line 35);

- a requesting message sending portion to send a requesting in which a task requests processing of the task initiator object requests processing of the task from other objects *(On-line auction company 12 also inserts into bid entry form 76 graphical picture 72 and description 74 of the current item being auctioned... When bidders 38 access bid entry form 76, graphical picture 72, description 74, bidding groups 66, and total bids 68 are displayed on their remote computers 30; col.6, line 65-col.7, line 5);*

- a bidding portion to return a bidding message if an action corresponding to the task that is requested in the requesting message is present in the reaction table *(After contributing bid amount 62, central computer 18 updates total bids 68 in real-time, step 136. Changes in total bids 68 are dynamically displayed to bidders 38 by sending commands from HTML template 22 to Internet browser 29... central computer 18 determines if the bidding session is completed, step 137. If the answer is NO, central computer 18 returns to step 131, receiving another bid entry form 76; col.8, lines 4-35);*

- a bid awarding portion to determine, from among objects returning a bidding message, an object to which processing of the task is assigned *(The next step after completing the bidding session is processing a winning group... At the end of the bidding session, on-line auction company 12 declares the one bidding group 66 having the largest total bid 68 the winning group, step 141. Next, the winning group is displayed on remote computers 30 for bidders 38 to view... indicates the winning group; col.8, lines 36-46);* and

Art Unit: 2126

- a bid awarding notifying portion to notify the selected object of a bid awarding determination; wherein, if there are a plurality of competing objects that can provide an action in response to the task request by executing an action in response to the requested task when receiving a bid awarding notification, the selected object, of which task processing is requested, is determined by a bidding system *(Central computer 18 then sends the winning bid records from mail server E1 to mail server E2 of account company 26. Account company 26 uses bidder name 44 and bidder identification number 50 of each winning bid record to match each winning bid record to a corresponding bidder account 40; col.8, lines 47-59).*

Brown teaches “bidder database 14...record bids in the on-line auction; col.6, lines 17-24, and col.8, lines 4-18).

Brown, however, does not explicitly teach “a reaction table to store an action content which is a reaction to the message and wherein a reaction relationship of messages and actions defined in the reaction table drives the object collaboration apparatus.”

“Official Notice” is taken that “a reaction table” is well known in the art [M.P.E.P. 2144.03].

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Brown for a reaction table because it would have provided the capability for recording and updating the bids from the bidders in the remote computers.

As to claim 2, Brown teaches the bid awarding portion uses, as one bid determining parameter, a communication time that is necessary for communication between the task initiator object and the objects sending the bidding message, and preferentially awards a bid to an object that has a short communication time between objects (col.8, lines 4-34).

As to claim 3, Brown teaches the bid awarding portion uses, as one bid determining parameter, an empirical value of past processing performances for similar tasks of the objects sending a bidding message, and preferentially awards a bid to an object that is expected to have a high processing portion selects an object that is good at processing the requested task, and preferentially awards a bid to an object that is expected to have a high processing performance for the request task (col.8, lines 35-60).

As to claim 4, Brown teaches the bidding portion includes, in a bidding value, a bidding parameter that shows its own condition with respect to a task for which the bidding portion returns a bidding message, and the bid awarding portion determines a bid-winning object using the bidding value as one bid determining parameter (col.8, lines 4-60).

As to claim 5, Brown teaches the bidding portion sends the bidding message using, as one bidding parameter, processing resources that can be assigned to a requested task processing, and the bid awarding portion selects an object having a bidding value indicative of large processing resources that can be assigned, and preferentially awards a bid to the selected object as the bid-winning object (col.7, line 45-col.8, line 46).

As to claim 6, Brown teaches the bidding portion sends the bidding message using, as one bidding parameter, an object load ratio showing a ratio of the already assigned processing resources to the bidding object's original processing resources, and the bid awarding portion selects, from the object load ratios in the bidding values, an object having a small load that is already assigned, and preferentially awards a bid to the selected object as the bid-winning object (col.7, line 45-col.8, line 46).

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 7, Brown teaches the bidding portion sends the bidding message using, as one bidding parameter, a computer load ratio indicating a ratio of the already assigned processing resources to the processing resources of a computer that is executing the bidding object, and the bid awarding portion selects, from the computer load ratios in the bidding values, an object that is executed on a computer having a small load that is already assigned, and preferentially awards a bid to the selected object as the bid-winning object (col.7, line 45-col.8, line 46).

As to claim 8, Brown teaches the bidding portion sends the bidding message using, as one bidding parameter, a skillfulness at the task, which is based on resources available to the bidding object, and the bid awarding (col. 8, lines 4-46).

As to claim 9, Brown teaches the task initiator object has a bidding portion that generates a bidding message in response to the requesting message sent by the task initiator object, and the bid awarding portion processes the bid awarding selecting an object in accordance with bidding messages sent from both other objects and a bidding messages from the own terminal's bidding portion and selects the most appropriate object for the task processing from among all objects including itself (col.7, line 45-col.8, line 46).

Claim 10 is directed to a computer-readable recoding medium for implementing the method of claim1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) rejection.

Applicant's arguments presented issues which required the Examiner to further view the previous rejection. The Examiner conducted a further search regarding the issues mentioned in Applicant's response. Therefore, all arguments regarding the cited references of the previous rejection are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Dinwoodie	US 6,415,269 B1	issued date:07/2002
- Fisher et al.	US 6,243,691 B1	issued date:06/2001
- Harrington et al.	US 6,161,099 A	issued date:12/2000
- Ausubel	US 6,021,398 A	issued date:02/2000
- Ausubel	US 5,905,975 A	issued date:05/1999

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

Art Unit: 2126

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450


or fax to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(703) 746-7238 (for After Final communications)

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications)

VHN
09/05/03



**JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**